

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP  
Nina D. Boyajian (SBN 246415)  
*BoyajianN@gtlaw.com*  
1840 Century Park East, Suite 1900  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-2121  
Tel: 310-586-7700; Fax: 310-586-7800

Attorneys for Defendant Sonos, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
WESTERN DIVISION**

SOUNDEXCHANGE, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

SONOS, INC., a Delaware corporation; and  
RHAPSODY INTERNATIONAL INC. dba  
NAPSTER, a Delaware corporation.

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:25-cv-05454-HDV-BFM

**STIPULATION RE: BRIEFING SCHEDULE AS  
TO DEFENDANT SONOS, INC.'S MOTION TO  
DISMISS, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE,  
MOTION TO STAY**

Judge: Hon. Hernan D. Vera  
Action Filed: June 16, 2025

1 Defendant Sonos, Inc. (“Sonos”) and Plaintiff SoundExchange, Inc. (“SoundExchange”) (Sonos  
2 and SoundExchange together, the “Parties”), by and through undersigned counsel of record, hereby  
3 stipulate to a briefing schedule on Sonos’ forthcoming Motion to Dismiss, or in the Alternative, Motion  
4 to Stay (“Motion”).

5 WHEREAS, on August 11, 2025, the Parties filed a Stipulation to Extend Sonos’ Time to  
6 Respond to the Initial Complaint by 15 days, from August 18, 2025 to September 2, 2025 (ECF 14);

7 WHEREAS, on August 7, 2025, the Honorable Naomi Reice Buchwald in the Southern District  
8 of New York issued a Memorandum and Order in the case of *SoundExchange, Inc. vs. Sirius XM Radio*  
9 *Inc.*, 1:24-cv-05491 (S.D.N.Y.) (“*Sirius*”) finding that SoundExchange does not have standing under  
10 Section 114 of the Copyright Act to litigate royalty disputes (*SoundExchange, Inc. vs. Sirius XM Radio*  
11 *Inc.*, 1:24-cv-05491 (S.D.N.Y.), ECF 86);

12 WHEREAS, based on the ruling in *Sirius*, Sonos’ counsel advised counsel for SoundExchange  
13 that it intended to file the Motion based on the threshold issue of SoundExchange’s standing to litigate  
14 the royalty dispute before this Court;

15 WHEREAS, SoundExchange advised Sonos’ counsel that it contends that the *Sirius* Order was  
16 wrongly decided, is not binding on this Court, and SoundExchange intends to appeal the Order to the  
17 Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit;

18 WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed to the following briefing schedule for the Motion:

- 19 • Sonos’ Opening Brief: September 9, 2025
- 20 • SoundExchange’s Opposition: October 9, 2025
- 21 • Sonos’ Reply: October 30, 2025
- 22 • Hearing on Motion: November 13, 2025 (subject to the Court’s availability)

23 WHEREAS, the Parties agree that there is good cause for the further extension of time for Sonos  
24 to respond to the Complaint, particularly given that the date for Sonos’ opening brief (i.e., its initial  
25 response to the Complaint), is less than 30 days after its initial response deadline of August 18, 2025.  
26 There is further good cause for an extended briefing schedule given the threshold standing issue

27 //

28 //

involved. The Parties have been diligent in conferring and agreeing on this extended briefing schedule, which will allow the Parties additional time to confer on and brief this dispositive standing issue.

**IT IS SO STIPULATED AND AGREED.**

Dated: August 19, 2025

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

By: /s/ Nina D. Boyajian

Nina D. Boyajian

*Attorneys for Defendant Sonos, Inc.*

Dated: August 19, 2025

COBLENTZ PATCH DUFFY AND BASS LLP

By: /s/ Christopher J. Wiener

Christopher J. Wiener

*Attorneys for Plaintiff SoundExchange, Inc.*

**ECF CERTIFICATION**

Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 5-4.3.4(a)(2)(i), I hereby attest that Christopher J. Wiener, on whose behalf this filing is jointly submitted, has concurred in this filing's content and has authorized me to file this document.

Dated: August 19, 2025

/s/ Nina D. Boyajian

Nina D. Boyajian